

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

[REDACTED]

Must Remain in
Transcription Room

So gradually we have changed the Wednesday evening to a little bit more in the direction of talking about Work and Gurdjieff and objectivity. Originally, you know, it was not the intention and only to use it, you might say, as a background against which we could talk about different subjects of interest and then

from that standpoint. Not that I mind it very much but it may be better if you restrict as much as possible your particular questions regarding Work to Monday. But anyhow, we'll see. What kind of subjects are there that we can talk.

Q. Can you speak about Yoga.

N. Do I want to?

Q: I wanted to find out exactly what - if you knew what the purpose of it was for.

N: What is Yoga in general for?

Q: Discipline.

N: For what?

Q: To establish a certain control - flexibility of the body

N: You think that's all?

Q: No

N: If it's the body you may as well become a wrestler. Or, to stay in the same line, a fakir.

Q: How about the mental discipline?

N: That is really what we would want. And then there are other things added to it which are necessary in order to help the but the purpose is mostly to reach through the mind and mental discipline a certain state.

Q: And what do they mean by meditation?

N: Meditation is a function of the mind. When they meditate

and they do it in a certain way they want to reach by means of the mental development a certain higher level of and if possible to reach contact with something that exists which they consider, of course, as superior quality. Meditation then is used simply as one of the means of reaching it.

Q: What does the word actually mean?

N: To consider. Are you going to be a Yogi?

Q: No, but it interests me. I might be a Yogi.

Q: Could you tell us something about what love is? And the relationship between love and what we call soul or the spirit.

N: What kind of love are you talking about?

Q: Love in the most general form.

N: Well, you have to define it a little bit more because we use the word love for so many different aspects of one's life.

Q: I would say love between two human beings or

N: Yes but you relate it to soul.

Q: Yes.

N: Has it any relation to soul?

Q: This is my question.

N: Is it? You want to know that : I would say no.

Q: Why would you say no?

N: Because I don't think it has anything to do with the soul.

Although sometimes it's used, you know, like in the German word a relationship between two souls and that sometimes one calls love. But love has many aspects. If Love on earth is considered it goes as far as possible relationships between the three centers of man and there is a possibility of unity on a physical or an emotional or an intellectual level. The love that has to exist between two

people, when it is really love, is a consideration of the other person and to create for that person conditions in which that other person who is being loved can grow. Now this applies to the possibility of a conscious state. If there is a conscious state, there is a possibility of consciousness uniting and emotion uniting and physical bodies uniting. But usually it's called love on earth when it is in the more or less superior sense is meant by an emotional involvement and human beings sometimes try to keep it on that level and sometimes they are not successful and although they every once in a while wish to keep it there, and if they were taught how to keep it there, maybe they would not fall into the trap of the physical relationship. Whenever one considers the possibility of a relationship between two people, either consciously or unconsciously, it simply means that for such persons it is necessary to have an understanding first of an emotional kind. Sometimes it's called spiritual. It is necessary to understand that man has really two different aspects of himself. One, his physical appearance and the manifestations of the physical body, which may be instigated by either feeling or by a thought process, and also that there is something else in a man which he tries to define if he possibly can as a high feeling quality - of a certain emotional kind - sometimes understood by one's mind and sometimes not at all but nevertheless existing, with which then such a person, trying to live, would like to reach a higher height than he has in ordinary life, in ordinary

When it is a conscious state there is a difference between that what then consciousness could do and gives at a certain time insight to the possibility of how an emotional relationship should exist. Consciously, as far as the mind is con-

cerned, if it were fully developed would be able to create between two people such understanding that they even could create for them selves in their manifestations the conditions of an understanding on a conscious or an intellectual scale. It would enable them to use certain words which could be understood by each other without having to haggle about it or without having to argue. And that the point of understanding is not an agreement but that they could understand each other even if the opinions would differ. This would reach because of that a certain form of unity of an understanding not equal in having the same kind of viewpoint but in appreciating each others viewpoints and to let it go at that. Because one knows what the other one thinks and respects it. Emotionally, if a person is further developed than what his feeling center is at the present time, he would be able to be with someone in an emotional state, sharing with this person in the first place an aspiration towards wishing further growth for both and also to have within themselves an inspiration which would be to some extent a guide in what direction this growth should take place. But the ultimate of an emotional relationship would be the possibility of two people being together and in each others presence without having to use words and to exchange in silence. As far as that particular relationship is concerned, there should not be any argument at all; it should be completely understood even without words and there should not be any difference in their emotional states, It should be as close as it could possibly be made of an absolute

. I say there is no argument; as soon as there is any argument emotionally it never works. Physically, it is it is another question. Many times or a

chemical attraction which many people don't understand well enough and they think that it is a relationship of their feeling, but since the feeling center is constantly expressed in the behaviour form of the physical, it takes over and then the physical starts to act, and starts to act on each other and if there is any kind of what I call now chemical attraction it usually wants to end up in any form of physical unity. How to solve the problem. I think it is very difficult because we have no education in the direction of the possible spiritual development. It has been neglected and therefore no one has really the facility even of wanting to understand it or to know even that it exists. And the mind is of very little use because it does not concern itself with such problems. And those who are more or less interested in it, let's say partly in an artistic or in a religious direction are usually concerned from the standpoint of ordinary man a little bit extraordinary and almost sometimes as if they don't belong to earth because they don't fulfill their usual functions as a man should do. Usually meaning by that that he should be in life, in business, earning money and so forth, taking care of a variety of things which are mostly expressed in the forms of behaviour as far as the physical body is concerned. So for that reason, not having the education, man and woman are usually left to the place where physical expression becomes paramount for them. And that they every once in a while try to express by means of their body as manifestation certain feelings or certain thoughts and they try to say it in a certain way; many times they cannot find the proper words and are misunderstood, and usually the feelings are not subject to the possibility of being interpreted or formulated

because there is a difference in nature between a feeling and that what they can put into forms of words. So, therefore, man being what he is - 90% physical, 6% or perhaps even more feelingly and about 3 or 4% intellectual - naturally it is that the physical of man predominates. And physics, physical center, having its own wishes every once in a while and, as I say, mostly based on the chemical of such a physical body does not know any better than to follow attraction wherever they are and sometimes tries to rationalize about it and tells the mind or sometimes the feelings that that is then for them love when it is nothing else but an ordinary physical attraction. I say how to solve this depends entirely on the building up first of a feeling center relationship as well as one can and a certain form of understanding to the extent that the mind is capable of it. and that in ordinary life if man and woman would be happy, and this ever hereafter, that then in the first place they should aim at establishing a relationship of understanding between them; also that they have a feeling in which if they possibly could be in silence together without having to argue and that, when that is there, that then I would almost say the're entitled to have a physical relationship. Now the difficulty with that is that in ordinary life the development of the physical body is always ahead of any of the other two centers and that, therefore, when a person comes to maturity, physically speaking he is quite ready to have any kind of a union, and that he has no balance in himself and has never been taught to put that under a certain form of control he will go wherever he can and wherever he thinks it's right and wherever he rationalizes it's correct and whatever the so-called morals or whatever the civilization will allow him to get away with what he calls then the desire perhaps of his body -

sometimes he is quite aware of that-but usually he would like to put it on the basis of that it is real love. And as a result, whenever that might happen, in any relationship - physically speaking now - either in the form of marriage or in the form of just living together, it simply means that after some time it wears out, and it establishes a certain monotony, or perhaps the filling of certain desires which then are satisfied, and there is nothing else to take it's place. Now we know that in ordinary life because we say love will not last unless there is a to base it on. And whenever there is this particular kind of, I call it monotony, it is not the same for man or for woman, it doesn't matter. But as soon as that kind of a relationship starts to be established there are many other complications that start to come in which were not there originally. One of the complications is children or abortion, and the other complication is that man is differently constituted as compared to a woman and that man in his nature is much more polygamous than a woman. That a woman wants to be possessed and therefore is quite definitely happy you might say when there is one man, whereas a man does not have that same kind of a feeling for a woman and is more or less, at least for some time, a philanderer. Now if he wants to continue with that, and if human beings want to continue to establish further relationships when certain ordinary you might say spontaneous relationships have worn out, something has to be done by them if they possibly can and try to re-establish unity on a different kind of a scale and then gradually, if they can stay together and understand each other more and more and are willing to sacrifice certain ideas of themselves, and in that sense could grow together that then such a marriage can be quite happy. But many times of course, as I say, the circumstances and influences

which are sometimes related to children and family and sometimes related to the continued wish on the part of the man to look around a little bit and have a good time, that for such reasons it is sometimes extremely difficult to adhere even to that kind of an ideal even if within ordinary living and in ordinary relationships it would be quite possible. The fact that is against them is that as they grow older they get a little bit more set, they crystallize out and they are less willing to sacrifice certain things that may be necessary for further continuation of such a relationship. Now on the basis of conscious love it is different, because there when there is something that is consciousness that has grown out sufficiently it may be able to balance out against the physical body. And that by means of an emotional - I mean by that now that that what is feeling has changed into a real emotion. That is, it is not only an emotion in the sense that we now use it as a word- I call it usually a feeling which is more or less centered in one's solar plexus, and where the different parts of such a feeling center are still spread all over the totality of the body itself, so that more and more this could become centered in one place and the place where then emotion belongs is the heart. So that if the heart starts to function together with a certain form of consciousness, the development of the mind in a certain sense, I mean now by that certain sense that it has to become more and more objective towards that what it manifest. That then a new note is introduced with which then the possibility exists that consciousness could actually, as an intellectual development, take a certain position regarding the body, and that instead of the body being dominating and the mind, as it were, negative in relation to that, that the relationship would be completely reversed, and that the mind then could become

number one as positive and body becomes negative. The emotions constantly the same kind of a part. Whenever they are related to the heart instead of the solar plexus they become of course more powerful because they are central, centrally located, and also they have drawn back different nerve nodes now functioning as a feeling center in the totality of the body into one center. And for that reason there is, speaking now in the sense of becoming conscious, a possibility of an emotional center functioning more and more by itself without having the necessity of expressing itself in the body. This means that is one emotionally becomes involved, then there is no immediate necessity of expressing it physically. And that for such people it is much better if they could have a relationship of an emotional kind and an intellectual kind of understanding before they would have any sex. The difficulty is however that sex comes up much too soon before any of these either intellectual or emotional parts of a man have been developed, and that all our whole educational system should have to be changed because we are not paying any attention to it and leaving it simply to Mother Nature and then assuming that whatever happens with Mother Nature is quite correct. Now as far as earth is concerned it is correct. There is no particular reason why for any sexual relationship a man should have to understand a woman because usually the understanding is related only to that what they experience whenever they may have sex. But whenever there is a possibility of being free from it, they have to wait until the desires of the body have been exhausted and then, with that kind of a freedom, they have nothing to do than simply to look at each other and to continue either to live together or to get a divorce or to stay together for the sake of the children or perhaps for the sake of other people, the Joneses and so forth, what they would say about them if they would get a divorce or even if they would separate.

Now I think all of that becomes, you might say, from the standpoint of earth and in our present civilization, more or less naturally or acceptable. It is that we make the adjustment to it the way it is at the present time simply because we don't know any better. If you go back to the Aborigines and the different people who are primitive, they have a much saner viewpoint, and for them that what actually takes place and usually the Aborigines, who live in the tropics, have a littler easier life as far as clothing is concerned, that one is becoming more and more adjusted to the fact that people when they are naked are a little different as far as sex is concerned, and that little children are brought up in that kind of a surrounding without having any particular secrecy or anything that is to be hidden. Our civilization - the way we are - and many time dogmatic religions, have played that it is necessary to keep such things a secret and usually cover them under fig leaves and the rest of it. And it is absolute nonsense from the standpoint of even nature, but it is our culture that does that. And we live in that and we simply become subject to it and it cannot be changed because who is there who is going to change. Now there are certain cults of course who try to change, like the nude colonies and all the rest, it is sometimes a little strange but nevertheless the principle that's involved is quite right, but at the same time, it is utterly impossible to do it in our civilization where the emphasis in this civilization is based on industrial development - on the development of a certain body in a certain way, appearance, beautifying oneself whenever one can, and practically all the time forgetting that there is a spiritual value in each man or in each woman. So, if you want to look at it from that standpoint as love between two people, you cannot start with this particular

idea unless something has grown either in man or woman which is familiar with the kind of a feeling that is needed in a relationship between the two and for that reason I say that that kind of a spiritual development first has to be in either man or woman regarding themselves, and that first what they have to have is a love for themselves for the sake of wishing to grow and that sometimes it may be expressed as love for their art and that sometimes it may be love for their religion and an understanding of their God and whatever may be represented by their way and mode of life. But many times art starts to go on the wrong road because it is not continued in the direction that art indicated; it is continued in the direction of commercialism. And religion is not continued in the way it was originally meant as conduct of life but it has become dogmatic. So that certain restrictions that have been placed on that, which may be historically explainable, at the present time form for him a certain prison in which he has to live and against which he rebels many, many times. Now how to solve that problem cannot be done all at once. It only can be done if man or woman as a human being tries to understand whatever their function may be in this ordinary life and to be able to understand with life as a stepping stone for something else that is, of course, for them higher and in which they might have belief or at least hope that they could reach it if they only know how to express - how to develop themselves and to cut themselves loose; how to get freedom from that what is now their bondage. Man is bound at the present time by his body. And logically so because he lives on earth. And that the only possibility for him to be free from his body is to understand what this bondage is and to develop certain things in him that are not subject to the laws of earth. This of course is the original

meaning of spiritual development and that is why it has that name - spirit. Because spirit means that it has a certain form of density which is much lighter than the matter out of which the material body is made and for that reason, if there could be an existence of that kind, it would be above earth or perhaps even be so free from earth that it would leave it. In ordinary terms it would mean that man could be able to develop in himself a certain idea as if he is building for himself a certain house in which he wants to live and in order then to be free from the effects or the impressions with the ordinary life given him. And that he finds in himself, with this building, certain things in which he can live where he need not be affected by the rest of the world around him. This of course is a very long process, and it something that is very seldom even understood, let alone that one can indicate in what direction one should go. But you see when you talk love you have to talk about love of oneself. Love for oneself, the wish to grow. Love for that what is a deity or a higher form of being or something that sometimes is called His Endlessness. A love for the wish to understand the place of man on earth. A love for the understanding why on earth there happen to be two sexes; why it is that within our framework of civilization there are so many aberrations, even as far as sex is concerned and that it is extremely difficult for man to find his proper place in relation to other people because he is constantly influenced and affected by whatever someone else does and there is nothing in him that is stronger to know exactly what he should and should not do. As far as civilization is concerned, it doesn't help a bit because that is based on what other people have considered the best way out as it were, and gradually certain laws or customs have been established which

have no rhyme or reason any more. Sometimes they appear on the books a law and they are not and sometimes they are simply by common understanding in order to stay out of the arms of the law or, like in marriage, to prevent children - when they are there and they are not married, then they are illegitimate, and then everybody looks at them and so and so is criticised for this and that and the other. It makes it tremendously complicated for any one man or any one woman to know what exactly to do. Because they are driven constantly by something that they know every once in a while is not entirely right but it wears off if there is too much of that kind of sensation and finally it falls. I call it a fall simply because we fall into it and it is something to which we are driven without having any particular guide, any kind of support, any help from anyone outside, and very often those who write about it or those who may have children and supposed to know it or who already have reached a certain position in society, very often they are very bad fathers and mothers and very bad for the wish even to understand the children and very bad even to understand that sometimes certain conditions and customs are changing in accordance with historical development. So you see the problem is much more complicated than you might have thought, and it is good to think about it and to see what could if man could have so-called consciousness. That is, if he actually could understand what it is to understand each other, and as I said before, if it were possible for man to forego his selfish desires or that what he selfishly would want and in which he sometimes draws the other, and as I say many times rationalizes about it in order to fulfill what he really wishes as far as his body is concerned and instead of that, that he could with his mind sufficiently

developed understand what is needed, not for him, but what is needed for his mate and then create such conditions which would be right for that person - not for him. And that he is instrumental in creating such conditions for the other person that they can grow in the direction that they are able and not in accordance with what he or she would like him or her to be. And that the mistake is made many, many times that I want to make my wife or my husband in my image. And I've absolutely no right. And I have to learn how to be with each other and still allow enough of a development possible for anyone in whichever direction they wish to go. That then I become instrumental in creating that kind of a condition for them. You see if that is the form of love that one is really interested in, the emphasis is an entirely different one. It is not just kissing, hugging, having a good time. It is something that I consider as how can I create a world for those that I so-called love and that I say my beloved and my love par-excellence, the one and only maybe. So that for that I could create this kind of a condition in which they then in turn loving me create for me the same kind of conditions. You might say, to a certain extent, let me alone in my development, but surrounding me and I surround the other with that kind of a possibility or atmosphere or influence in which they themselves could follow what is really within them the most important part of themselves. I say looking at it from that standpoint it's quite a different thing and it may take a little bit more and the maturity of the body is much too fast. And the result is that we have unhappy relationships. And that the emphasis in our present civilization is constantly on the development of the body and to be able to do certain things or to produce or to have a mind that functions as a machine and to be clever in that way. We neglect many, many times that what is really the most important part of man, which is his

feeling, and the ability of man to collect his feelings into one center so that it actually could become a force. As I say, the basis of all of it is on a person himself, to have in relation to that what he could become a wish to grow and that, for that reason, realizing the condition in which he is at the present time that there is a great deal to be done and for that reason there has to be Work. Because mother nature is not and even if art starts where nature leaves off, art if not sufficiently developed in one's own feeling center to be able to go outside of the rules of nature. So that many times I settle for the different things that are around me and then, as I say, hoping for the best and the best will never come. Enough?

Q: I have thought that one of the hardest parts
or the death of the ego.

N: Well, ego would mean selfishness wouldn't it? Because ego means my self. Egoism would mean that whatever I do or think or feel is toward myself. Very often it is at the exclusion of someone else, or if it affects someone else it usually means that I do it at the expense of the other so that true egoism would mean that I take something away from someone else in order to use it for myself for whatever gratification it may bring. But when Gurdjieff says a man really has to have it, it means that he has to live for himself but not at the expense of someone else. And that he could in the proper sense develop with all the different material that is available without hurting anyone. That it is not either altruism or selfishness as we usually call it; it is then something that he himself is able to do without affecting anyone
→ else and perhaps, because of this, being able to affect someone else in a good sense. If you consider marriage on that basis, naturally it is selfish that I want to become what I want to become, but if that

is in order to gain more understanding so that then I can be for someone else what the other person would require, then it is not selfishness. But ultimately, of course, in any kind of a relationship if I do this I will profit. There isn't any question about it. But the person who profits first is the person I love; when they start to develop I get a refund on my original investment. Don't take the words selfishness and egoism too strict. There are many things that are not at all egoistic. They are quite definitely altruistic and it's only a definition of terms. But if one is engaged in doing something it is worthwhile to see whatever the motivation would be and that many times what we usually call altruism or charity is certainly . At the same time if I am kind to an animal because I love it, certainly I am not particularly egoistic in giving it food. And only to some extent that the dog would be happy when he sleeps .

Q: I am presently reading a book, The Way of a Pilgrim. In the book it tells of a pilgrim who achieves a state of happiness and inner peace through continuous inner prayer and I have a feeling that what the pilgrim experienced isn't exactly a complete state of consciousness as having to do with Work. But I'm not really certain. Could you possibly compare the two?

N: Well, you know what the pilgrim in that book tries to develop is an emotional state of possible unity with that what he calls a deity. It is very much like a monk or a saint would try to work. If they then start to develop their particular emotional because it is of that quality, and the concentration of that whatever their feelings are focused constantly on the possibility of reaching a higher level of being and perhaps, in a sense, trying to unite with it or at least to be in contact with it. They

develop this emotional center, this feeling, as something that really becomes much more important than anything else of themselves and that, as far as the body is concerned, all the different desires are more or less rejected, and that, as far as the mind is concerned, the concentration of any kind of a thought is also on the possible development and the sensitivity of one's emotional center. Now to what extent they can reach it, it depends a little bit on the amount of sacrifice that they are willing to give, to give up of that what or that how much time, thought, and feeling they are expending in that direction of reaching that what would be a first impossible and gradually they become convinced that it is possible and the more they then go on that road, the more they become an emotional person. As far as work is concerned, and the development of any one of the three centers, even if it is a fakir or a yogi or a saint, is simply that they become regarding themselves as a man a little bit lopsided. And although for themselves it is of extreme value and it is something that they wish and they are willing to sacrifice everything else, I think they do not fulfill the function for which they were born on earth as a man. One can have an idea the sooner I reach a state of a development away from earth, the way I am the sooner I reach the possibility with a deity, or with as it is called in the mystical sense, that I reach that kind of a level in which I am united or in which smiles on me and takes me by the hand and so forth. Whatever it may be, one can say that if I reach that it is enough for me because that is my ultimate aim, to be free from earth and I don't care how I have it. At the same time, there is some definite reason for man that he is born on earth and it does not necessarily mean that he has to become either a fakir or a saint or monk or a yogi. It

means that he has to remain man as long as he is on earth, and as long as he is on earth he has to fulfill the obligations that are laid on him as a responsibility because he happened to be born. Now I can forego that. That is, I can say, oh, but I don't have obligations, and one can say, yes, I am here, but it's not my fault. So that when I wish to accept myself the way I am on earth, it may mean that I want to get through with earth as soon as possible and I want to close my eyes for the kind of responsibility that I might have. Even the fact that I appear on earth and that I represent on earth a certain form of life as manifestation that I say I want life and I don't want this body and I want to find some means by which this life of mine can continue away from earth. I think, in such a reasoning, one forgets why or even asking the question why man is on earth. Why wasn't he born somewhere else. Why is it when he is on earth that he doesn't understand it. That is a different kind of a question. For exactly because there are apparently some difficulties in wanting to understand and I don't know how, it should encourage a man first to find out if he could find the answer to that particular question. If he is man on earth, perhaps the fact that he is man might have a meaning because he is not God. We make a distinction between man on earth and God above. We make a distinction between earth and heaven. We make a distinction within oneself of that what is material and what is spiritual and sometimes I say that what is spiritual is of more value but if that's the case and I don't let it then I also miss the opportunity that I have and I simply call it a responsibility because if I am finding myself with the two things and one is a little developed and the other isn't, I ask the question why isn't it developed. And I cannot let it go until I am satisfied that it should not be developed or should be developed.

So you see this particular problem, is man fulfilling his function if he becomes an expert in any one of the directions of the three centers, even if for himself it is quite satisfactory, one might at such a time call it selfish, but a different one, because their aim is not for themselves; their aim is to unite with that what is the all living force and for them to merge with it or to reach a state of nirvana. Whatever it may be that motivates a person like that, I still think that he is negligent in the realization of a responsibility which he has simply by the fact that he has been born and that now it is up to him to free life which is in him in the best way possible and that I don't think that he reaches this kind of a freedom when he develops only one center because he was born with three centers and it is necessary for him to develop those centers to such a state in which they are, not equal, but are harmonized. And if then the aim of man is to become harmonious in that sense, then he should stay on earth as long as he possibly can in order to fulfill that kind of a function. You see I have no particular right of saying I don't want to be here, therefore I go, I say, I am here. This happens to be a pragmatic fact. Now what is the meaning for me being here, and what is it that motivates other people or what is it that I as a person, not being born even on an uninhabited island, that I find myself in the presence of a variety of other people exactly like myself and that then the question of what is the meaning of my life on earth, in society, in relationships with other people, being driven by different thoughts or feelings or motivations of my body, and whatever it is that I call now my civilization in which I happen to be, there must be a very definite reason that if I want to become a man to understand it that I have to start searching for that kind of an answer. Now if I go too far emotionally I miss the

opportunity of becoming a man totally and, as I say, even maybe for such a person like The Way of a Pilgrim, a very interesting one as far as his own feeling is concerned, he is not in the end a man. He is only developed emotionally. If he wishes to become a man , he will have to go back and go through the path of a Yogi and develop his intellect with whatever is prescribed for Yogi-ism, Yoga, Yoga and all the rest, and of course it will include then a certain development of his body, and he should also try to go in a direction of a fakir, a real one I mean - not a fake, who is actually interested in the development of his body in the correct way, so that then when a man starts with one or the other and the other in successiveness that then he has no time in his life to fulfill it. For that reason I think as far as Work is concerned, a man like the Pilgrim is of course on a certain road and the road is very good for him but not a road which is good if the ultimate aim is harmonious man. And that man first should fulfill whatever function is required and as long as he is on earth and as long as he is allowed to breathe on earth and as long as he is allowed to be under the influence of the laws of earth, that then his function should be to understand such laws and if he doesn't like them, or if, and I mean by laws, laws of gravity - laws of physical gravity, laws of psychological gravity, laws of his own growing up in surroundings where perhaps he has nothing to do with himself how to become, but that he was formed because certain conditions happen to be around him, or that he with certain tendencies coming from his father or mother was born in the way he is as a type, or that perhaps as a type he is astrologically whatever he happens to be at the moment when he was conceived or born on earth. That all these different factors have to enter into anyone considering his life for whatever value it might have and to see what is

reasonable for him to become, and then if he accepts the fact that there are ~~there~~ three centers more or less pronounced which function in a different sense that then in the first place the necessity is to bring harmony among the three centers. As he is, unconsciously, it is a very uneven battle because they are not sufficiently developed by themselves, so that in order to become harmonious it would be necessary first for man to understand that certain centers are not developed at all and, that is, that his intellect is practically not developed, and that his emotional center is only half developed and that all he has is his physical center which of course is predominating so that no harmony can really come from them. I am afraid it is and always would remain log-sided, even if at times it becomes a little cacaphonical. Although such rules and whatever the regulation for that kind of a harmony is, we really don't know. But in the first place it is really necessary to have if one wants a certain form of unity more or less an equality, not necessarily as far as the totality of such energies is concerned, but at least that they fit and can join together like, use simply the idea of a key and a lock, but this time of three different kinds of concepts or perhaps entities which at a certain time and for the sake of harmony have to become harmonious; that is, that they can work together without any further disturbance inside. This is really the concept of . You see, there are these two different things about harmony. One is that is produced by the combination of certain sounds which in themselves produce in themselves a certain form of arrangement which is in themselves harmonious. That is, not cacaphonic. Whereas the totality of that what may be played as sound and of may be quite cacaphonical because the people around it cannot understand that kind of a form of harmony. Now that grates on one and for that reason one only wants to talk about the harmony

as presented to the outside world, and one does not want to talk about harmony within. And as long as there are certain satisfactions guaranteed that it is in accordance with what Bach says should be harmony and with what in accordance with certain other rules of Chinese scale or Indian or whatever it may be, it also considers harmony for that, and that we, as far as we are educated understand the Gregorian chant in the proper way, and that we also sometimes because of our present civilization, the way we have grown, that we understand jazz and rhythm in a certain way. Whatever it may be, that is, the emphasis is constantly on what is represented and the affect on others. Whereas real harmony is that what is produced by a man, whatever he is, and his harmony is within. And that that what is the deity is then compared to that what is harmoniously within him and is harmoniously connected so that it becomes for him a unit. If that is the aim of man, to become that, then he has to have a development of any one of the three centers and, if possible, with their interrelation, the simultaneous development; that is, the development has to go on at the same time when one develops the other is developed, because this is the way man is built. He is not as yet free from each other center or rather, each center is still influenced by the other two. So you see the problem then becomes a little bit more difficult because at what time is it possible to become harmonious; at what time can I say that one or the other or the third center has grown out sufficiently to become a body like the physical body is a body, and that then, do I have to wait until it is full grown or can I already produce harmonious sounds within myself even if it is a little bit of a failure, that there may be some little openings which ought to be in a harmonious spherical state, that still there is a semblance or at least an indication

of something that could become harmonious and that what I might be potentially has in it the possibility of further growth and becoming actually what it should be. So you see, when I follow the line of the Pilgrim, it is all right for me but I have to do something else in addition to it, and what is called in ordinary life in a religious sense the fourth way is simply the possibility of the development of any one of the three centers to its fullgrownness and that, of course, would imply so far as intellect is concerned, the direction of consciousness in which then there is this kind of an understanding of what I talked about a little while ago and where then this particular kind of a mind and mental function can actually be free from any one of the other two centers. It simply means in intellectual terms that it has to be objective, because anything that is subjective in my mind is bound constantly with that what is my feeling and usually with that what is my body. So that whatever thought there is, the expression of such a thought, if I am alive, is always activity. Sometimes it remains as far as my mind is concerned in the development of constant, let's say, juggling of certain thoughts together , but whenever there is associative thought, whenever there is something that takes place in my mind, the ultimate aim is usually the application in the form of a manifestation of my body. To remain pure as thought and be satisfied it is surely quite against all development that we are at the present time interested in, particularly industrially speaking. Now as far as the feeling is concerned, in the first place the bringing back to one central point which could become an emotion; in the second place, that what is the feeling center as far as the body is concerned, it is only half developed. And that what is necessary for the further development of what Gurdjieff would call Kesdjanian body is on the octave scale the sol la si of . So that if there is a possible development in man to become objective and he goes in the direction of his intellectual body developing again according to the scale, the parallelism that there is between the do re mi of the

first part is then parallel with that what is sol la si of Kesdjan. Now as far as physical body is concerned, the development that is necessary there, since the octave has already reached the si do , is the relation between si and do. This in man means freedom or not freedom, because ultimately with death he is free--free from his body. Whatever remains is free and the do, which is then the end of that physical octave simply means that si has then gone over to do, and that the relationship between si do indicates the way man at the present time on earth is bound to himself, to earth, to his habits, to his way of thinking and to his way of feeling. And that if there is any possible development now in three directions, it would indicate first the development of the intellectual beginning as do into a fullgrown body which then is called soul, an emotional body which is called Kesdjan, which means the configuration of that what is in man already as his possible feeling center or his spiritual development in the direction, as I have said before, in the direction of perhaps a development of art or religion. As far as soul the intellectual body is concerned, that what helps him is an understanding of philosophy and an understanding of science in the true sense of the words. As far as the si do of physical body, it means that man has to become free, because the freedom is indicated by death. So that mainly the aim of mans' life would have to be that he should die at any one time because that is the freedom for which he is really, you might say, alive. He would then fulfill his function be setting free that what is his life; free from the bondage of earth or free from the bondage of his body and that, as a result of any kind of work on oneself, unless these three different requirements are fulfilled, man will never become harmonious. So you see when a pilgrim is on his way, he forgets too much about his intellect and all he does is to starve his body in order to be free from it in that way, but he doesn't solve the problem of remaining in his body and be free. It's quite easy, more or less easy, to withdraw from the world. It is fairly easy to be

as a monk and forget about the world, to negate that what may be desirable or to kill them by not fulfilling them or by not eating enough or to withdraw and live on bread and water , but it is not a man. A man is a man who can do, who has all the capacities that are required for a man so that he's able to manifest himself and to be helped by whatever process of his thought happens to be there and whatever is feeling in him and that his body is in balance between the two and that then whenever there is a relationship between either mind and body or between feeling and body that the totality of man should be made up of mind knowing what to do, of emotion giving the force or the energy to do it, and the body actually to perform. That would be a man. A real man is a man who can think independently, who can have emotion from here until the stars, and who can have the ability of the-- of his body to be able to do at any one time that what is required for his body to do in accordance with the requirements of that what is in the outside world and, without being selfish, to know exactly what to say or not to say; what to feel and not to feel; what to think and, to think. And in this doing, to manifest through his body all the different sense organs in the proper way and to have in his mind a function that actually can give him light and in his heart has a function that can give him heat or warmth. You see this is an aim for harmony. And then when he has this, or at least is on the road, he is quite sure that he can fulfill the obligations which have been laid on him, so that at any one time after such responsibilities have been met, that he could leave earth, so that he can say, I am (through), now I can go because my task to make the payment to Mother Nature has been paid up in full and I have, you might say, a receipt for it. I think the book is good for only that possible development; for at times to be interested in what is an emotional state of the correct type. As far as work is concerned, it is no help.

Q: Mr. Nyland, because of my work--in ordinary life--my art form, I have to deal with centers correctly, to convince the public of what I am doing. So I deal with the emotional center, the intellectual center and the physical center as if I am sitting behind them. I have to try to manipulate them to convince them, and I've been doing this now for about four or five years and I've been working for more or less intellectual audiences. I must be more convincing, so that the manipulation and experimental and very exciting. When I'm working this way I feel intensely awake.

N: Well you see the difficulty you will have, like all performing artists is that they emphasize the necessity of a relationship between whatever there is in one's mind or in, let's say, one's heart and the body itself. And that the expression of whatever the body is doing, one becomes identified with it for the sake of showing to the audience whatever the manifestation has to be. I say the difficulty is that one always, that one remains identified with it for the sake of an audience and, naturally, wanting to give whatever it is possible to give, and that in itself, there is nothing against it; it is quite right. It's exactly the same as when one paints a picture or when one is interested in studying the body and whatever may be it is necessary for him to make that or as beautiful or as indicative of certain things as it is possible to do. But always it remains the difficulty regarding work. Because identification is something that I have to go through first; then realizing I am identified, I have to go through a period in which I separate my feeling from my mind and the manifestation of the body and the only way I can express that is saying, I want to become impartial. You see, what takes place in ordinary life is that the three centers are connected and sometimes quite haphazardly without any particular control. Now it doesn't count if I say it is as if I am in back of me and I perform. Because there is nothing in that; it is only

a little thought and it becomes a little hallucination. But when there is the actuality of an I, which is independent of any one of the three centers, and if then that what I manifest and what I wish to feel and what I wish to think is directed from this standpoint, where I is independent, where I is impartial and where I understands the value of the moment, it's quite a difference. In order to become convincing, I first have to be free from that what I want to use for the conviction. When I am free, then I go back and with this freedom, which we call then awareness or being awake, I now manipulate my body without losing the identification or non-identification which I . I now make myself do; at the same time retain I directing that what has to be done. And it is not directed any more from my mind but it is directed from a different kind of, I call it, level of being which is represented by my I existing and having particular qualities and that is, being non-identified, being impartial and having an understanding of momentary existence. It's quite necessary to see this. Because that what kills one in a performance in any kind of performing art is exactly that they don't live by the moment. I am constantly interested in how I am; constantly interested in the effect I make. As a matter of fact, that is the whole purpose and I remain identified.

Q: I feel this is how it was before but it's no longer true.

N: Good, that may not be . I am only saying and if that is not there and it can be directed from an impartial standpoint, it is that kind of an objectivity which will give really color and force and, I call it, reality to the performance.

Q: The question is that we're discussing ideas now without experience , there's a big gap.

N.: There is no gap. We talk about and we talk about trying to get a little bit more of understanding to see how it is and so forth, I have no gap whatsoever because I know what to apply. That I would like

to apply it to very difficult situations, of course, that goes without saying. But it also means that I shouldn't be a fool. That if I have to learn something from the beginning, I start at the beginning. And therefore, there is no gap whatsoever because the stimulus for wishing to work means that I now become aware of myself in very simple activities. And it has as yet nothing to do with any kind of performing art; it has nothing to do with life as I usually know it; it has to do with myself as I am at times when it is possible for me to be awake. And in that respect one has to be very honest. When I say it's a gap, I try to apply it already to the most impossible situations, that are utterly impossible, where it is already foregone conclusion that I fall asleep in our sense of the word.

Q: Can this work take place on an experimental level?

N: It can only when you become less and less identified.

Q: Whenever one is professionally engaged, one becomes interested in that whatever one makes or does or presents to the public.

Q: that my professional life would not be that way anymore. It's a promise I made to myself some time ago.

N: A promise is not enough.

Q: But I am very much in earnest.

N: But earnest~~y~~ is not enough. Honesty is not enough.

Q: But I wanted to bring to the work, to you, because you are my first source for this work, the first sort of opening up of the ideas to me--a man, first man and I feel I want to contribute.

N: There is nothing to contribute. I simply repeat a few things that come from Gurdjieff and even Gurdjieff didn't contribute anything because he took it from other people. It is existing and has existed and always will exist of the possibility of man freeing himself from the bondage of earth when he finds himself on earth. How to do it is very simple and there is absolutely no particular gratitude

so whenever I talk it happens to be because I happen to be a little older and I know a few things that I have heard before; there is nothing original. So I am not ; all I am is a channel through which a certain form of knowledge happens to flow. And don't have the idea that you have to contribute. You just sit; soak up what you can, go home and use it. Never mind the contribution. It's not a performance. It is not for any kind of an audience. You don't have any obligation to anyone, not even to me. All you have to do is to take in what you can . I know this desire on your part. You've mentioned it before. It's nonsense. I don't wish it. I don't have

I don't want I just want to be. And if that being represents something, well and good. I am very happy.

Q: I would like to apologize for coming into class at the time that I did. For Margaret and myself. There was no possibility of being in the class at the time that I should be here. There was no way of being here.

N: Good, Ralph, If it's an apology--accepted.

Q: Thank you. May I ask now about my task? That was interrupted this morning. It was the concluding day of the task. The task was interrupted at five minutes after ten and had been going for ten minutes. May I tell you what happened? It is the day which I sat in the chair. I was to my armpits. I had five minutes to go I believe, perhaps six or seven more to go; perhaps it was eight minutes that the interruption came. I would like to tell you what happened.

N: Ralph, let me suggest something. You were not here when in the beginning I said that Wednesday has a little bit, I wouldn't say deteriorated, but has gone in a little different direction from the way I think it should go. I do not like to talk too much about Gurdjieff or surely not about tasks or experiences even. I would much rather have it that we use it as giving a little bit more light to certain instances and whenever it is a description that we are now embarking on, it is a little bit too much

for Wednesday, and I would keep it 'til Monday. Monday, it's all right. By that time I think you will have digested a little more and it will be a little easier to look at it from something that has happened a little further in the past, you see? Will we agree on that?

Q: Yes sir, but may I excuse myself by saying that you asked me to

N: Yes, I know. I know, I haven't forgotten. That was only because I didn't want to talk about it then. Then I said talk about it tonight. Then when we are here tonight now I say let's talk about it Monday. Now, Ralph, maybe on Monday I say let's talk about it on Tuesday.

Q: May I ask you, sir, if I may continue my task and complete it?

N: Yes, that is right.

Q: Can I continue the task 'til Monday?

N: Yes, you can, yes you can.

Q: Thank you.

Q: I just had a question about the idea of identification. When an artist is identifying do you mean that the mere fact that he's interested in what he is doing and the effect means there is an emotion or a feeling present and, therefore, is not impartial?

N: When one is unconscious, something of oneself becomes identified with the performance as represented by the manifestation. And the identification is then that I am interested in the impression I make on an audience. Part of me goes out, as it were, to the audience and simply the identification is that that part belonging to me I would like to communicate to the audience for some reason or other. Like when I paint or when I play, there is something there that I wish to create as an impression on others so that perhaps they would buy my painting, or perhaps they will say, how wonderful you are. This I call identification, and I think on earth it's quite right. And there is no objection to that identification if it stays within certain reason. Because sometimes it becomes quite conceited and sometimes it becomes nothing else

but an ordinary self-expression which is thrown onto the audience as if they then had to take it for whatever it is and admire it and I sulk if they don't admire it and whatever may be, I think there are certain limits even on earth one draws. But at the same time, I remain identified with that what I am doing and within reason it is permissible. But now if one works, I first have to learn to become non-identified in order to free the different centers that function myself from each other. And the thing that I am mostly interested in is that my feeling center needs the body for an expression. It even has gone into the language. When I say I feel I mean the state of my body. I don't really say that I feel whatever there is in solar plexus. There is a certain activity going on but it is immediately expressed in any kind of a state of my body the way it is--tension, coloration, a certain way of behavior, posture, whatever it is, as a result of a feeling. The relationship between mind and body is not as strong; there is a possibility sometimes of having a thought that goes on in one's mental function and still having a poker face so that it doesn't express itself. But with feeling it is practically impossible to have a feeling without a manifestation. Now when I say that identification is really something that is in the way when I want to work on myself, or really want to become objective, I mean by that that anything, if it is the objective road I want to choose, that anything that remains subjective naturally is an obstacle. And that the worst obstacle is the relationship between my feeling center and my physical center because it never could function harmoniously under the command of something that is independent whenever it is already a foregone conclusion that it has to join or has to become neutrally expressive. So this is what I have in mind by saying I wish to become non-identified in order, afterwards, to become harmonious and harmonious in the sense in accordance with my will; not in accordance with the wishes of either my body or the wishes of my feelings. So the objectivity simply means

that trying to become non-subjective must include that whenever I have a relationship in observation between my mind and the body, whatever the manifestations are, that I will not allow any kind of a judgment of an emotional kind. It is the only way by which I can indicate that it is objective. When I say that it is non-subjective, that is, none of the other centers play a part, it is one relationship between mind and body only. If I do this and I try to develop this kind of a relationship and in that sense then develop the possibility of an objective faculty, I have to begin with something that could remain independent and also as a result of that kind of work the relationship between the expression even of a feeling and my body more or less gets a little looser and ultimately will not be necessary and can start to function independently of each other. If this state of being awake can continue and can be maintained, then I will dare to go and intentionally manifest. But this time, the manifestation is not directed by either that what the body wishes or what the feeling wishes but what my I wishes.

My I so long to try to explain it, my I becomes identified to a certain extent with a higher level of being, and the direction then of that what I now want to perform is from the standpoint of my being instead of from the standpoint of any one of the centers. I will be able to reach much more harmony because that what is now being guided has no more will of its' own' it can be joined or not joined at will from my side as far as my being is concerned and the real seat of my being is that what is within me unchangeable and not touchable. So when I say I wish now to perform, I participate in my performance, but I remain awake. And with this awareness of myself as I perform I do not wish to have any emotional content unless I wishes. I do not want any manifestation unless I wish my body to perform. And I don't want any expression on my face or any expression of any of the sense organs to take place unless I is the judge who is trusted. You see that changes

it entirely. It is not that I object to identification but I do object to identification which is an absolute necessity an identification which can be controlled . A real performer must have this unchangeable something within, so that that what is being performed becomes directed from that what is immovable. You see that what is objective can then return, as it were, to earth and become subjective. But as long as it remains on earth, it will never become objective. For that there has to be that kind of a if that isn't there it won't function. That is clear? It concerns one. It concerns any person who is performing. Any person who has to give or contribute something if he wishes--to the world as it is or to the future generation, or even a performance in which one wants to find oneself. Even if it may mean that one has a certain purpose in life which I want to fulfill and it may even be that by means of that kind of a performance, I have an intention of achieving a result which I now wish to happen, to let it happen in an audience. I mean there is absolutely no objection to wanting to create a certain effect. As a matter of fact, if I want to have conscious I, I certainly have to have a very definite aim and it never can be a self-expression, but it has to be an aim that is linked up with the wish to do certain things for the good or benefit of mankind or to him for a certain state or to create in them a certain form of aspiration or perhaps religiousness or even perhaps enjoyment. The same way as sometime on earth I try to achieve the same kind of thing by playing a wedding march or maybe a march of so that people who are going to Viet Nam . Whatever it is that I have as an aim, with time it has to be conscious so that I have to direct it and I cannot let it go simply by hoping for the best. Consciousness means directing. Consciousness means control. Consciousness means to be able to do and also to be able not to do. Not to be under the influence of certain that I have to, but if I wish, then I can, but I has to be there

So I think it's enough? But, I have to pay five cents every time I say 'so.' So, any more questions? Ralph, you don't mind to hold it until next Monday?

Q: Not at all. I'm glad to be able to continue the task.

N: Good. You could have anyhow even if you reported on it. Who is it? Miriam. Yes, Miriam. No question about work.

Q:

N: Prayer is where the three centers are united for an aim. And there is an entity in man that he wishes to achieve something either for himself or in relation to something outside of himself. He has an aim wishing to find out whatever conditions may be that they are and could remain conducive for himself and his own goal. Whenever man prays he has to have in mind his possible development. He does not have to have in mind to serve God or to hope that God will help him. He has absolutely no idea what is good for him unless he is awake and is able to see what he is when he is asleep and to tell God what to do, which very often is a form of prayer--let's have good weather so that I can have a picnic--is of course no prayer at all. Whenever one has three centers combined--head, hand and heart; whenever it is united as well as one can make it even if they are not entirely fully developed, that that kind of an entity in that kind of a form could in words create a prayer which, without any question, is being heard within one. That what hears it is one's God but for this purpose the God is within oneself. It is not a God sitting on a throne somewhere else in heaven. It is something that is my inner life and I pray to that so that is actually put into certain form or words or posture or an attitude and that something in me very close to that what I said a little while ago which is unchangeable can hear it or at least can take notice of it. It does not mean that that prayer will be fulfilled. It does mean it will be heard. How it expresses itself, very often it has to do with the manifestation of the

body in a certain way, more or less belonging to that what one would
 , or the way that one feels, and that very often it has to have,
 you might say, a sacred way of manifesting. Many times like an expression
 by means of a dance, a temple dance or a sacred dance or by stretching
 out one's arms or holding something as if precious, or that
 the body requires then to do in order to remain, you might say, in bal-
 ance so that what one feels and what is there for oneself as a possibil-
 ity of a higher development. Sometimes one goes down on one's knees;
 sometimes one just stands still; sometimes one is looking up at the ;
 sometimes ; sometimes one holds oneself together
 as if it is a unity that one wants to achieve even with one's body.
 Many times it's a question of not having extraneous thoughts; to be con-
 centrated on that what one really wishes to feel or think. Whatever it
 may be, there is unity in mind that with a prayer and the
 value of it depends entirely on the amount of unity .

So, we'll let it go then for next week? Bring some more questions that
 we can talk about. We talk about certain things that are important in
 oneself, you know that. Don't be too glib about it. Don't be too smug.
 And don't be ashamed to be interested. Each person should have it. To
 some extent at least. And if they superficially, it is
 all right. . But never interfere with anyone
 else . Always encourage someone whenever they have a
 desire or anything that is pointing in them towards a wish to become more
 spiritual. Never laugh at them. Leave them alone if you cannot help
 them. that something is there that is desper-
 ately wishing to come out into open. Even if you don't have it, don't
 feel so superior that you are when you don't have it superior; you are
 not. You're quite inferior without any question. A person's emphasis
 is not on his body; it is on his spiritual inner life and his being as

it should be and the hope that he should have for becoming what he is at the present time not now, without any question; he is not what he should be and all of us are in exactly the same kind of a boat. So whatever you want to use and whatever you want to do, it's up to your conscience to the extent . But whenever you go on this particular kind of a road, be patient and go on and go on and hold on; don't give up. It may not be easy but it is worthwhile. So, have a good week all of you. Hope to see you next time. Good night.